## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# TRANSLATION INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

applicant's or agent's file reference H103-2666-WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416					
nternational application No.	International filing date (day/m	onth/year) Priority date (day/month/year)					
PCT/JP2004/011990	20.08.2004	12.09.2003					
nternational Patent Classification (IPC) or n	national classification and IPC	1372/10					
B01J23/63, B01D53/9	4, B01J3//U8, FC	1103/10					
Applicant	-						
HONDA MOTOR CO., LT	D.						
This report is the international punder Article 35 and transmitted to	reliminary examination report, esta o the applicant according to Article	blished by this International Preliminary Examining Authority 36.					
2. This REPORT consists of a total		sheets, including this cover sheet.					
<ol> <li>This report is also accompanied b</li> </ol>							
		otal of sheets, as follows:					
	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative						
sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.							
b. (sent to the Internation	onal Bureau only) a total of (indicat	e type and number of electronic carrier(s))					
٠. 🗀 ،		, containing a sequence listing and/or tables					
related thereto, in com Section 802 of the Adn	puter readable form only, as indicatinistrative Instructions).	ted in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see					
4. This report contains indications							
Box No. I Basis of	of the report						
Box No. II Priorit	у						
Box No. III Non-e	stablishment of opinion with regard	to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
57	of unity of invention						
Box No. IV  Reasoned statement under Article 25(2), with regard to novelly, inventive step or industrial a citations and explanations supporting such statement							
Box No. VI Certai							
	n defects in the international applic						
	n observations on the international						
		of completion of this report					
Date of submission of the demand	Date	or completion or the report					
1 11 - 11 1 - CAL IDEA II	Airthe	prized officer					
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/J	Audi						
Esseimila No.	Telep	Telephone No.					

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/011990

Box 3	No. I		Basis of the report			
1.	. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwindicated under this item.					
			port is based on translations from the original language is the language of a translation furnished for the purpos			
			nternational search (Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b))			
		Р	publication of the international application (Rule 12.4)			
			nternational preliminary examination (Rule 55.2 and/or			
2.	With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):  the international application as originally filed/furnished the description:					
		pages		as originally filed/furnished		
		pages*	•	received by this Authority on		
		pages*		received by this Authority on		
		the cla	ims:			
		nos.		as originally filed/furnished		
		nos.*		as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19		
		nos.*		received by this Authority on		
		nos.*		received by this Authority on		
		the dra	awings:			
		sheets		as originally filed/furnished		
		sheets				
	_	sheets	*	received by this Authority on		
	Ш	a sequ	nence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplement	ntal Box Relating to Sequence Listing.		
3.		The a	mendments have resulted in the cancellation of:			
		the description, pages				
			the claims, nos.			
			the drawings, sheets/figs			
			the sequence listing (specify):			
			any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):			
4.		This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).				
			the description, pages			
1			the claims, nos.			
			the drawings, sheets/figs			
			the sequence listing (specify):			
			any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):			
*	If it	tem 4 ap	plies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "supe	rseded."		

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box	No. I	V Lack of unity of invention
1.		In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:
		restricted the claims.
		paid additional fees.
		paid additional fees under protest.
		neither restricted the claims nor paid additional fees.
2.	$\boxtimes$	This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.
3.	This	Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
		complied with.
	$\boxtimes$	not complied with for the following reasons:
		The matter common to claims 1 to 9 is an exhaust
		gas clarification catalyst comprising an aluminium
		oxide and, supported thereon, a palladium oxide.
		However, the search has revealed that the
		catalyst is disclosed in the document JP 05-285387 A
		(Hitachi, Ltd. et al.), 2 November 1993, claims 1 and
		2, and thus it is clear that the catalyst lacks
		novelty.
		As a result, the above catalyst falls within the
		scope of the prior art, and therefore, the common
		matter (the above catalyst) is not a special technical
		feature within the meaning of PCT Article 13.2, second
		sentence.
		Therefore, since there is no other common matter
		among the inventions according to claims 1 to 5 and 9
		and the inventions according to claims 6 to 8, which
		is considered to be a special technical feature within
		the meaning of PCT Article 13.2, second sentence,
		(Continued in Supplemental Box)
4.	Con	sequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
	$\boxtimes$	all parts.
		the parts relating to claims Nos.

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

	citations and expla	nations su	porting such statement	
1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims	3-8	YES
		Claims	1, 2, 9	NO NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
		Claims	1-9	NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-9	YES
		Claims		NO

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Box No. V

- Document 1: JP 01-168343 A (Toyota Central R&D Labs., Inc.), 3 July 1989
- Document 2: JP 62-282642 A (Toyota Motor Corporation), 8

  December 1987
- Document 3: JP 03-068451 A (Toyota Motor Corporation et al.), 25 March 1991
- Document 4: JP 05-285387 A (Hitachi, Ltd. et al.), 2

  November 1993
- Document 5: JP 51-123794 A (E.I. Dupont Nemours and Co.), 28 October 1976

The inventions set forth in claims 1, 2 and 9 lack novelty in the light of documents 1 and 4 cited in the international search report.

Documents 1 and 4 set forth a catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas having palladium supported on LaAlO<sub>3</sub>, and a catalyst device for clarifying motor vehicle exhaust gas using said catalyst. LaAlO<sub>3</sub> exhibits trigonal or rhombohedric crystals, as described in the description of this application.

The invention set forth in claims 3 to 8 does not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 1 to

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

4 cited in the international search report. Claim 3

When using palladium as the catalyst metal of a catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas, having the supported palladium serve as a perovskite composite oxide in order to prevent deterioration under high-temperature reduction was a known technique at the time of filing of this application (see document 2, for example). That being the case, it would be easy for a person skilled in the art to conceive of supporting palladium as a perovskite complex oxide in order to prevent deterioration of a catalyst in the catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas set forth in documents 1 and 4.

#### Claims 4 to 8

It was known at the time of filing of this application that  $LaAlO_3$  could adopt a perovskite structure. Moreover, it is a known technique in common practice to have a carbonic acid complex serve as a constituent element in producing a perovskite composite oxide (see document 3, for example).

The inventions set forth in claims 1 to 9 do not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 2, 3 and 5 cited in the international search report.

Document 5 sets forth, as a three-way catalyst, a catalyst which is obtained by supporting a perovskite composite oxide containing a catalytic active metal on a perovskite composite oxide support such as LaAO<sub>3</sub>.

Meanwhile, using a perovskite composite oxide containing palladium as the catalytic active component of a three-way catalyst was a known technique at the time of

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

filing of this application (see document 2, for example). That being the case, in the three-way catalyst set forth in document 5, it would be easy for a person skilled in the art to conceive of supporting a perovskite composite oxide containing palladium on a LaAlO<sub>3</sub> support. It is a known technique in common practice to have a carbonic acid complex serve as a constituent element in the production of perovskite composite oxides (see document 3, for example).

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

- a) Patent document 1 set forth in paragraph [0004] of the description of this application pertains to a thermoplastic resin composition. There is understood to be an error in the number of patent document 1.
- b) Paragraph [0039] of the description contains the wording "produce  $Pd/Al_2O_3$  using the same method as in production example 1". However, production example 1 is a method of fabricating and a method of supporting composite oxides, therefore it is unclear to what type of production method producing  $Pd/Al_2O_3$  "using the same method" as in said production example refers to.

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 4 and 6 contain the wording "the step of adding... to group of compounds (OH group)". However, it is unclear whether said "step" refers to a step of manufacturing the support component, or refers to a step of producing a support component, or refers to both steps, therefore claims 4 and 6 are unclear. In making the assessment of inventive step, in the light of paragraph [0009] of the description, said process was deemed to refer to the step of producing the support component.

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

#### Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

(Continued from Box IV.3)

no technical relationship within the meaning of PCT Article 13.2 can be found between those different inventions.

Accordingly, it is clear that claims 1 to 9 do not comply with the requirement of unity of invention.